

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/778,045	09/778,045 02/07/2001		Takahisa Kurahashi	925-177	6211	
23117	7590	03/25/2004		EXAMINER		
NIXON &		•	CRANE, SARA W			
1100 N GLE 8TH FLOOI		D	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTO		22201-4714	2811			
				DATE MAILED: 03/25/200-	DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Com		09/778,045	KURAHASHI ET AL.					
(	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	1				
		Sara W. Crane	2811	by				
<i>۲۰</i> Period for Ro	ne MAILING DATE of this communication appeping	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)⊠ Re:	sponsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Fe	ebruary 2004 (RCE filing).						
<i>,</i> —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
, ——	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
clo	sed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition	of Claims							
4a)	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-8 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> </ul>							
6)⊠ Cla	Claim(s) <u>1-8, 15-20</u> is/are rejected.							
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)∐ Cla	aim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application	Papers							
9) <b>□</b> The	specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	placement drawing sheet(s) including the correct e oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority und	er 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.						
3.[				Stage				
O.L.	application from the International Bureau			3.				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attach								
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of	References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice of 3) Information	Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) (s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/778,045

Art Unit: 2811

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-8 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krames et al. in view of Saeki and Vakshoori.

See reasons of record in the Office action of 24 September 2003. As noted there, Vakhshoori column 3, line 4, teaches that a single layer can function as a mirror. It would have been obvious to replace the upper DBR of the device of Krames figure 13 with a single mirror layer, because the processing steps would be simplified. This would not change the functioning of the Krames device, as argued by Applicant, because the DBRs in the Krames devices function as mirrors. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to texture the top surface of the device of Saeki figure 8B as taught by Krames et al. with respect to figure 13, for example, because such texturing enhances the light emission, as noted by Krames. The Saeki device has no DBR overlying the light emission layer, and needs no such layer (or other type of mirror) to function. The Krames texturing improves the light emission of any such device, as discussed in that reference, and does not require an overlying DBR to enhance emission. Thus this teaching would apply to the device of Saeki, even if it functions in a different manner.

Applicant's remarks submitted with respect to the rejected claims have been considered, but are not convincing as noted above. Applicant notes that none of the references anticipates the claims, and the examiner agrees. But there is motivation

taught for including texturing on the device of Saeki, and there is motivation to replace a multi-layer DBR with a single layer mirror, so the combination of references is relied upon.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Crane, whose telephone number is (517) 272-1652.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (517) 272-1562.

> Sara W. Crane Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2811